FREEDOM

NEW SERIES, VOL. I, No. 2 JANUARY 9, 1933 FIVE CENTS

CURRENT EVENTS

WITH fourteen million men and women out of work and living from hand to mouth in a desperate struggle to keep their heads above water news comes from Washington that in spite of the hard times there are still seventy-five individuals paying income taxes on more than a million dollars a year and four of these had incomes of more than five millions each. In fact, the combined incomes of the four amounted to $38,268,114. Seven others reported an aggregate income of $25,633,048. In other words, eleven persons have incomes of almost six million dollars each. There are millions of families to whom one thousand dollars a year would mean a luxurious living, yet here we have eleven individuals with an income equivalent to that of six thousand families at one thousand dollars each.

In addition to the foregoing, 10,799 individuals paid income taxes on incomes of $50,000 up. Their aggregate net taxable income was reported at $1,282,659,757, and as an evidence of hard times this was compared with more than $6,000,000,000, which the 43,184 richest men and women reported to the tax collector in 1928. Summarized on the basis of $1,000 a family, it means that 10,799 individuals had incomes equal to that of fifty families each. And in this cock-eyed world scientists tell us that that which differentiates man from the lower animals is his capacity to think—think what?

* * *

Senator Capper of Kansas who has made a lot of money out of selling advice to the farmer through his newspaper comes along with a scheme of government subsidy for the farmer which he claims will set things going again. Briefly the scheme is this. For every farmer who will sow or plant 20% less wheat, cotton and tobacco, raise 20% less hogs and produce perhaps 20% less of dairy products he would have the government pay a subsidy amounting to some $750,000,000. For, says this solon of Kansas, if the farmer who has been producing say, 7,500 bushels of wheat for which he gets in the world market $900, would produce 4,500 bushels he would get with the government subsidy about $4,000. The farmer would then have money to spend, and would spend it. The subsidy would be paid by the miller in the shape of a tax, "55 cents or 42 cents as the case might be" and would pass it on to the consumer. The "consumer would pay a cent a loaf more for bread and would stand a much better chance of having a job at living wages than he has today." He estimates the subsidy at three-quarters of a billion and says if it changed hands twenty to forty times it would increase the buying power of the country from 15,000,000,000 to 30,000,000,000 dollars. An original plan this to abolish breadlines by raising the price of bread. It sounds like our old friend the vicious circle to us. If each man, unemployed as well as employed, paid 20% more for his bread he would give the farmer that much more to buy manufactured articles with; but all the other workers would have to increase the cost of their products to offset the increased cost of what they buy from the farmer, so we should be left where we are. Of course, if this scheme of Senator Capper worked it would have the virtue of leaving him and his class with more wealth than they can use or waste, as the case is now. If he had suggested that the $750,000,000 be taken from the 2% of the population who own 70% of the wealth it would have the same effect so far as placing more money in the hands of the farmers for spending is concerned and at the same time would help to distribute the wealth of the country a little more equitably. This would not abolish breadlines, but, as Mr. Green said about the 30-hour week "it would be a step in the right direction." But then why speculate on the impossible? Senator Capper does not believe in a new deal. He is a rich man as well as a politician and his business is to offer medicine for malaria, not to drain the swamp that breeds it.

* * *

That this is a mad world and a stupidly cruel one is to be seen every day. While we should be callous to it by now when we read items telling us that Comptroller J. R. McCarl approved the treasury plan to prohibit employment of alien labor on federal building construction within 154.7 miles of the Canadian border or that 1,415 aliens have been ousted from the New York City hospitals, we almost despair of human intelligence. It is true that other countries do the same thing. While they may give legal justification it is stupid and cruel all the same. In France, for instance, people with money are welcome, but a foreign-born worker and potentially useful citizen must sign a paper in which he promises not to take any work offered him that can be done by natives. This has worked, and is still working, great hardships on many of our comrades who for one reason or another have been compelled to leave the country of their birth. And here, with unlimited natural resources and untold wealth, men and women are denied the opportunity to work and earn a living for no other reason than that they happened to be born in Canada or Mexico or some other place. The next step will be to deny these ousted aliens relief and starve them into leaving the country.

* * *

In our last number we commented on the opinion of Felix Frankfurter as to the liberalizing of the U. S. Supmere Court. Now we are told that President-elect Roosevelt's opportunity for liberalizing the court has become a topic of general interest in Washington, and among the "liberals" pulling wires for a job in case one of the present members should retire is that old wheel-horse Senator Joe Robinson of Arkansas. Considering that Mr. Roosevelt has been consorting and consulting with that ex-Quaker former Attorney-General Mitchell Palmer, who raped the constitution in his raids and deportation of thousands of men and women after the war, stranger things than this could happen. He might even appoint Palmer to the post; and what would Frankfurter say?

* * *

About a year ago a British scientist advocated a ten-year moratorium for science on the ground that we need time to digest the knowledge we have. About 4,000 of the 19,665 members attended the winter meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held during Christmas week at Atlantic City, N. J. About 1500 papers were read on the latest researches and advances in agriculture, astronomy, anthropology, biology, botany, chemistry, dentistry, education, economics, engineering, genetics, geography and geology, history, mathematics, medicine and meteorology, paleontology, philology, physics, physiology and psychology, the social sciences and zoölogy. Evidently these men and women have information to impart and are not impressed with the idea that it should be bottled up. Kropotkin often pointed out that the difference between a scientific congress and a legislative body calling itself by the same name was that a scientist presented his point of view and it was accepted or rejected according to the understanding and intelligence of listeners and speakers. The anarchist is in hearty sympathy and agreement with every attempt to enlarge and enrich life; and every one of these men and women who try to light up dark corners of our lives is, whether he or she knows it or not, our comrade at arms. Theoretically it might be a good thing if there were a wider diffusion of knowledge and a better understanding of many of the things affecting our lives, but to talk of a moratorium of science is to suggest a very unscientific thing. Life goes on and knowledge is gained in an unequal ratio by men. Science is revolutionizing our outlook and understanding whether we like it or not. If it were possible to influence men's actions by mere suggestions we should say let us devote more time to the problem of distributing the world's wealth than to creating more. As a case in point: we have recently been informed by the scientists in the Department of Agriculture that 250,000 acres of land are sufficient for producing the food supply for the people of this country instead of the 350,000 acres cultivated at present. If those same scientists would suggest a better system of distributing the wealth and make it as easy to understand, that would appeal to us much better. Of course, we have a plan but then it requires intelligence to understand it and that is why our progress is so slow. Perhaps the remedy lies in the prognostications of the technocrats that labor-saving machinery is increasing in such a ratio that within two years we shall have twenty million unemployed instead of twelve or fourteen million and production will come to a stop. Without venturing an opinion at the moment as to the truth of this statement, all we can say is, let us hope so.

* * *

In the meantime in this highly organized and complicated society of ours the Barter or Exchange Movement, discussed in our last issue by Jacob Baker, is growing rapidly and creating considerable enthusiasm among a large number of people. Kropotkin, William Morris, and other Anarchist or libertarian communists must be turning over in their graves and laughing at those who derided their theories as antiquated, even antedeluvian. In our highly organized society where those modern buccaneers the banker, landlord, government employee and other parasites must have a cut before a plumber can exchange his product with a barber, barter has been introduced in twenty-nine states. The system may have its shortcomings but the writer of these notes is all for it. It is enabling some poor devils who have nothing but their labor to obtain some of the bare necessities without outside parasites getting a cut from the transaction and that is something, isn't it? H. K.

German Trade Unions Turn to the Right

By A. SOUCHY

It can always be stated that the power of the proletarian political parties *in* the Government corresponds to the strength of the proletariat *outside* the Government. The former is merely a reflection of the game that takes place outside parliamentary circles.

A shift of political forces is noticeable in the entire public life of Germany. German capitalism, threatened in 1918-1920 by the socialistic laboring population, succeeded in averting the danger of socialism. The severe inner crisis in which German capitalism now finds itself, and from which it is vainly striving to escape, is not the result of attacks on the part of the revolutionary labor movement. It is due to its own inability to master the very forces of productions originated by itself. All suggestions for weathering the crisis, including those made by the theorists of the Labor movement, remain within the frame of a capitalist order of society. A solution which shall do away with capitalism and shall inaugurate a socialistic order of society can come about only through a forcible elimination of ownership monopoly in land and other means of production. Social reforms designed to ameliorate the worst evils of capitalism, and co-operation in the Government by the socialist parties, cannot abolish capitalism. On the contrary, such action will only contribute toward keeping it alive. *Socialism will see the death of Capitalism only when the working classes are socialistically trained, properly organized, and in control of the revolutionary forces required for such a change.* That even the dictatorship of the proletariat does not bring about socialism is shown by events in Russia. Czarism was thrown from its pedestal, the burgeois democracy was nipped in the bud, and the capitalistic means of production in the form of *private* capital were destroyed. Yet bolshevik state capitalism, with its social legislation and social insurance of the workman, is hardly nearer to a socialistic order of society than the capitalism of other countries.

An understanding of this situation is more important today than ever before. The German labor movement has not only declined considerably as a political factor, its socialistic attitude has suffered severely during the recent period of Fascism. This is shown most clearly by the attitude of the social democratic labor unions in the last political crisis. In the course of the last ten years the unions have frequently changed their theoretical positions. Before the war it was assumed that they had no independent socialist problems to solve. Shortly before the outbreak of the revolution the social democratic labor unions stood ready to co-operate with the owners of industry in an attempt to rehabilitate Germany's economic life—on condition that the unions should be recognized as full representatives of the working classes. When government authority was growing constantly weaker, capitalism not only gladly accepted the co-operation of the unions but rejoiced in this opportunity for strengthening its own weakened position.

At the outbreak of the revolution the attitude of the unions was that the introduction of socialism was the job of the political parties. Under the pressure of political events, however, a change in this conception soon took place. The Social Democratic Party could not bring about socialism. Organized labor was soon forced to realize that the fight between capitalism and the proletariat had to be carried on *in industry*. Socialism could not come from above; it had to be created from below, by the workers themselves. This truth was recognized by the proletariat, and the unions were compelled to take a definite stand regarding political events and to tackle the problems of socialism. Unfortunately, understanding as to how socialism was to be realized was hazy; it was generaly assumed that political control was the magic formula. At the time of the Kapp riots the power of the unions reached its highest point. The splendidly organized general strike not only broke the reactionary movement but showed the strength of the proletariat.

Yet, once more the unions failed to lead labor into channels which might have brought about a removal of the capitalistic ownership of the means of production and an upbuilding of socialism. They believed that they could make the best use of their strength by influencing legislation. It was soon admitted that the unions and the labor associations were entitled to a certain recognition in carrying out socialistic measures. The old slogan "Through democracy to socialism" was now changed to "Through socialism to democracy."

But the unions were still unable to make their influence properly felt in carrying through socialist demands. They did not touch the issues of private property and the capitalist means of production, and the socialist ministers could not fundamentally change the course of events.

During the following years the stabilization of capitalism and the final victory of the counter-revolution became more and more evident. Socialism was no longer the topic of the day, and the unions were compelled to adjust themselves to new conditions. They endeavored to find a safe mooring-place in the capitalistic state and to obtain proper legal recognition. The workers were insured against the insecurity of their material existence, not only in case of sickness but also in time of unemployment. Wage agreements were made legally binding. This, however, proved a double-edged sword; as in most cases the legal liability declaration was interpreted *against* the workmen. Special labor courts were created for the settlement of differences between labor and capital. It was thought that associations of producers and consumers, as well as labor banks, would pave a new way to socialism.

Under the influence of this development, the theory of "economic democracy" developed within the German labor movement. It gave the unions greater privileges and an increased importance in the trend toward socialism. But this new road was bound to lead into a blind alley; the capitalist monopoly of ownership cannot be removed in this way. A social revolution is necessary, and without it socialism will never be established. Reform exhausts itself within the capitalist order of society—it is unable to reach beyond it.

As a matter of fact the unions were unable to prevent the growth of reaction and of the capitalistic system, in spite of a profound economic crisis. A strong faith in socialism, which the labor organizations could have instilled in the impoverished masses, would have been the best defense against the rising tide of the nationalistic movement.

Under the incessant hammering of reaction the hopes of economic democracy collapsed. The growth of the national socialist movement resulted in a theoretical change of front on the part of the social democratic unions. Their socialistic mission was soon forgotten. Realities were again accepted as such and it was declared "that the unions must in every political situation utilize every opportunity to ameliorate the daily suffering of the masses."

(*Concluded in next issue*)

Ideals in Theory and Practice

(A lecture delivered several years ago by our late comrade George S. Seldes)

It is a little over a year ago that a seemingly casual remark, dropped by an old friend and comrade caught me in its grip and set my mind to thinking long and earnestly, and the result of my cogitations is the subject of my talk this evening.

It was in answer to all our speeches, in which we half seriously, half humorously dissected his ideals and his life work, that he let fall among other things this remark: "And I am happy to say that in my personal life I have tried to live up to my ideals." I may be misquoting the words, but not the sense they intended to convey. I will confess that primarily I may have been interested in the analysis of the statement as applying merely to my personal friend. But the thought grew and begat another, and very soon the problem widened in scope and assumed a very grave aspect. I am not going to lead you through the devious paths of the process, and I doubt very much whether within the short space allotted me I will succeed in covering an appreciable portion of the field, but I intend to make an honest attempt.

We will begin with the crystal form of the question: *To what extent is the idealistic individual bound to practice his theories, and how much of them can he practice without prejudicing the ideal?* To avoid the pitfalls of theorizing it will probably be best to put the question concretely: How far can and must an anarchist practice his ideals in his personal life?

The ideal of anarchy aims to free the individual. To break the chains which bind his manifold existence, to raise him above the crude interests and passions of force and cunning, competition and deceit. I pass over the theories and methods by means of which the end is to be attained. For our purpose suffice it now to dwell only on the individual as he is today and as he ought to be or some day will be in—let us say—the millenium: *A perfect individual.* We will accept as an unalterable truth that were an individual of today by some chance clothed in the purple of the future, he could not—under existing circumstances practice his ideal *in toto*—he would be taken, out of this world, either to jail or to Yasnaya Polyana. If we were somehow to get, through our telescope a glimpse of the millenium, we could still hardly get a complete view of man in that beautiful state—we do not know whether he would be entirely free of all the strife and passions arising from the qualities of sex, intellect, and temperament. Our present ideal of the future "free and equal" individual is built mainly on our present understanding of the relations and behavior of human beings of yesterday and today. In other words, in constructing an image of the individual of the future we are using the accessible facts, fitting them to the Frankenstein of our own making. Once we have reached that stage we must, if we are consistent anarchists, stop short, wait for the accumulated experience of the new phase of development. We may have occasion to return to this speculative individual, but now we will consider man as he stands today, in all the ugliness of artificial fetters and all the beauty of his vision of the kingdom to come. It is only with this particular individual that we are concerned, with the man who stands in the grim reality of the present looking toward the lofty ideals of the future, who must either bend or break in the effort to live his life as he thinks fit, whose life is a failure or a success just in the measure in which he succeeds in harmonizing the present with the future. This is the crux of my discourse: *Man's own success and, even more, the*

progress and success of his ideal are mainly dependent on whether he is practicing too much of his ideal or idealizing too much of his practice.

I should like it to be clearly understood that this is not an abstract philosophical discourse. When I speak of ideals and idealists I have in mind my ideal and the idealist professing it, namely: anarchism and the anarchist. But to those in this audience who may be of a different faith I say that every one of my assertions is applicable with equal force to their own respective cases.

From the time of the organization of the first little group of German Social Democrats in 1882 I have been either in the very vortex of seething activity or a much interested co-worker with many a group, organization, league, society, friends, knights, unions and other aggregates of individuals tied by the common object of changing, subverting, abolishing or destroying the present system. I was present at the conception of anarchism, and hope to be at its cradle. I have seen anarchist periodicals crop up like mushrooms and die in a day; I have seen newspapers, journals, magazines, living brief painful lives, dying agonized deaths. I have attended meetings in large cities where only one-twentieth of the membership attended, and that twentieth was I. I have lived in a time when to be seen in the company of an anarchist was considered *déclasse* even by our friends, the social-revolutionists. In our own day there has been little progress. At this very minute, when every day is an epoch in history, when nations are made and unmade in a day, when the tides of labor surge forward and capital puts forth its last effort to stem them—even now we find the same lukewarmness and apathy in our ranks. Why this indefference? I do not know just how many Jewish anarchists there are in this country. I suppose, like the rabble led by Moses out of Egypt into the wilderness, they refuse to get into the ranks to be counted, lest in his wrath the Almighty send once more the plague and decimate them. Our enemies estimate our numbers in thousands. Why then must one solitary Jewish anarchist organ, *Die Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, be constantly knocking at the doors like a blind man, begging alms to prolong its tortured existence? With thousands, possibly tens of thousands, of English-speaking anarchists and sympathizers, every effort to publish an English periodical has proved abortive. During the thirty years that we have been preaching the gospel of Freedom and Brotherhood to the downtrodden masses our ranks have been augmented by but few converts and have been depleted through numerous renegades. Does the fault lie in the truth or its practice? Why have we not assumed the dignity of a party, an organization, an influence (call it what you like)—a power to be reckoned with? Where are we to look for the faults, if faults there be?

I make bold to answer that the faults lie partly in our theories as originally preached, misconstrued and misunderstood, and partly in our methods of applying them to the present. To begin with, we started with a theory of negation and destruction. If my personal understanding is any criterion of what anarchy stood for thirty years ago, I will say that we had but one Credo:

Everything in this system is absolutely wrong and is to be exterminated.

We had not at that period given a thought to methods and other possible systems. Our millenium lay over the hills and far away, the revolution was yet abstractly remote, and there was no need of racking one's brain to think of the morning after. Not one of our teachers—paid any attention to the constructive phase of anarchy till the day of Kropotkin's Mutual Aid, which in itself is not an attempt to formulate any complete theory of a constructive system of future society. The result was logical and inevitable: In the process of wholesale annihilation we swept down and destroyed gentility of manner and speech, kindness and considerateness, love of the beautiful and artistic, poetry, cleanliness of self and surroundings, faith and loyalty, duty and responsibility, and a thousand other most beautiful attributes of life, which the human heart and mind had acquired only through long ages of crystallization and purification of the human being. I am not sitting in judgement on events that have become historical fact. It would be as unprofitable an occupation as sitting on the shore and commanding the onrushing waves to recede. I am not acting as attorney for either the prosecution or defense. After events have become accomplished facts, the better part of wisdom is to see them aright, to fathom their sources and appraise the results. That is why I called the results logical and inevitable. The only way to react against the iron heel of oppression is to steel your heart and array yourself in invulnerable armour; the deeper the iron enters into the soul, the stronger the rebound. There is not a more heartless and pitiless slave driver than an ex-slave. In the psychology of the masses every inward and outward attribute of the class which is oppressive becomes the symbol of oppression; there is neither time nor intelligence to discern which is the true weapon of oppression. The legislator, the priest, the plutocrat, the aristocrat, and all the clap-trap that goes with their accursed race must go. And so *all* attributes of the oppressing class become a crime and their antitheses a virtue—something to be proud of—something to display, as the insignia of the comrades freemasonry. But life as we live it now is unthinkable without some of these attributes.

We are not yet purified etherial cherubim frollicking in a gorgeous universe filled with music. We are still of the earth earthy, full of strife and envy and low passions, immured within the four feet of filthy space which the plutocrat in his generosity has allotted to us. Is the absence of poetry, art, beauty, a virtue? Thank the stars, there is a little of these in every life, for life would be worth nothing without them. Is crudity a virtue? It is nerve-racking. Is uncleanliness a virtue? It is disease. If faithlessness and filth, crudity, irresponsibility were virtues, we should rise every morning with prayers for the continuation of our present state, for surely we are very virtuous. The uses of culture, refinement and gentleness in this world are manifold. They are, to start with, the bright spots, the only things of beauty and joy, the oases in our sandy deserts, the sweet, refreshing, resting places in our barren wastes of grubbing and scrapping. In the future, when grubbing and scrapping will be no more, they may, perhaps, become the only things we will live for, they broaden our views, soften our relations, create social tolerance. In our struggle we need tolerance as much as hatred. Our gospel of hate must serve to draw sharply the line between ourselves and our enemies on the battlefield, but do we not carry it into our own ranks? It is only tolerance, properly exercised, that will eventually open the ranks to those of our friends and comrades, who, though differing slightly in their ways and views, are really fighting with us for one common cause.

While speaking on tolerance, I would like to say that its spirit should be exercised in equal measure towards our so-called Public Workers, those of us who through a series of conditions not entirely of our own making, have become the active propagandists, with no time left to earn our living. We are apt to expect of them to high a degree of immaculacy in their personal and private lives, and to forget that they too are human. It is a relic of hero worship to expect every public worker to be a superman, and the fault of intolerance to condemn his good work for his human failings. Many habits of life and traits of character are determined by certain occupations. After long practice the public worker is likely to become demagogic, undemocratic in his relations, and somewhat less frugal in habit than of his followers who must live by the lowest standards. Yet there is a wide stretch between those small faults and those of the autocratic, overbearing squanderer of public moneys. Only the other day a friend asked me why "Intelligent" is entitled to $10 a week more than he. My impromptu answer was that "Intelligent" could earn double that money as carpenter, which happens to be true, even if not the right answer. But this shows the attitude of my questioner; that equality is a process of levelling downward to the lowest standard.

How are we to make much headway when we repudiate any responsibility for duty voluntarily assumed? Several years ago I published a plea for organization. Not a soul responded. Two years later I had the consolation of having "organization" adopted at a conference of the Jewish anarchists in Philadelphia. But another formidable impediment arose in the terrifying word *Duty*. It is useless to argue that duties are self-assumed, that there is no iron bound constitution and consequently no punitive clause attached to non-payment or non-performance, "Duties" are not recognized. I do not know whether they will be in the future, I confess to my limitations in conceiving any social work done without self-assumed responsibility. I do not even know whether we will ever be freed entirely of all the inequalities of sex, mentality, temperament and other characteristics arising from geographical, occupational and social environments. Will these inequalities operate much the same as they do today, or will the mere absence of authority and the extinction of drones neutralize every human weakness? That is a subject for speculation. What is no speculation to me is that we will never become perfect individuals, "free and equal," except through proper organization, recognition of joint responsibility to the common cause, absolute faith and loyalty to those who have reason to expect them of us, our fellowmen.

The individual of today stands clothed in the grandeur of the royal purple of the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of his own sweet will but deprived of any duties. Through his own isolated efforts he could not possibly prepare in a month all the complicated commodities he used in one day. But this is the individual who now reigns supreme in "society."

Will this individual become free through society, or will society become free through the individual? Speculate as we may, our individualist anarchist is only an anarchist with a *proviso*, an apology; there is always the condition of *universal* happiness indispensable to his own. Say what you will about your individualist; raise him on a pedestal and bring to him the burnt offering of "society," worship at his shrine, as you now worship at the shrine of the child, making a fetish of it, trusting to its own nature, refusing to employ the subtle method of mental suggestion. In your effort to create physically and mentally vigorous men of the future, you disregard the Terrifying Present, and you may turn out hothouse plants, weaklings unfit to cope with trivial difficulties. Does this sound to anyone like an attempt to lower our ideals? Not, I hope, to anyone who knows me. I cannot boast of having been able to live *up* to my ideals, but I have never wanted to live them *down*. I have not receded one step from the foremost radical thought, but I find that in worshipping the creative faculty we are losing sight of, or relaxing our vigilance over destructive forces, and I believe that only the equipoise of both will bring forth the destroyers of the old and the creators of a new and better world.

FREEDOM

Successor to ROAD TO FREEDOM

NEW SERIES, VOL. I, No. 2

A Weekly Journal of Anarchist News and Opinion

Published Weekly by
Road to Freedom Publishing Ass'n
219 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.

EDITORS
L. RAYMOND HARRY KELLY
M. JAGENDORF

Application for second class matter pending

* * *

Single copies Five Cents; $2.00 a year

The name THE FUTURE *was originally selected for the paper, but when application for second class mailing privileges was made it was found that name was already in use so* "FREEDOM" *was substituted*

Letters to the Editors

Thanks for "Freedom," Vol. I, No. 1. This is the nicest kind of Christmas present.

I am sending my subscription and $3.00 extra as a donation.

Cordially,

N. Y., Dec. 24 Leonard Abbott

* * *

Yours of the 8th just received.

Yes, I think the paper is all right and I am heartily with you. . . . "Freedom" looks all right.

I will write at once an article on Technocracy—not denouncing it, just reviewing the situation.

Los Angeles, Cal., Dec. 18 T. H. Bell

* * *

The new "Freedom" has just arrived. I congratulate you and your co-workers. The paper is much larger than I had expected. It makes a very good impression and the contents are interesting. Of course I had suggested a weekly of a more distinctly revolutionary-labor character, but I suppose they (the comrades) have their own ideas about the kind of paper they want to publish. Of course it is to early to judge the paper, but I do want to say that I am glad to see it appear and I hope it will soon gain a large circle of readers and be able to exist. There is no question but that we badly need such a publication.

Nice, France, Dec. 21 Sasha,
(Alexander Berkman)

* * *

I just received your letter this morning, and as I just wrote an article for our Swedish papers about the German Trade Unions and their attitude towards the actual politics, I am sending you a copy of it. I can easily understand that this article will be too long for you, but you can cut it as much as you want and take just those parts of it you think interesting for your paper.

I hope that *The Future* (see page 4 for explanation) will have success and I send you all good wishes.

Berlin, Dec. 8 Augustin Souchy

* * *

Just had your note and it is refreshing to get such brilliant confirmation of the fact that you are still "going strong" and doing excellent work.

I will, of course, write something for the new paper, but not before the middle of January.

With greetings and best wishes for the success of the new venture.

Sincerely yours,

Paris, Dec. 10 A. Shapiro

* * *

Upon confirmation received of the report that you have printed the word Anarchism on the mast head of the paper "Freedom," we, the Libertarians thank you and promise you our sincere cooperation in the future.

Fraternally yours,

N. Y., Dec. 19 Libertarian Group

* * *

It gave me great pleasure to see and read the first issue of "Freedom." As an Anarchist, I certainly welcome the appearance of one more publication, where the doctrine of Anarchism is being propogated.

My congratulations to the editors for their use of plain and simple English, that can be understood by the average worker as well as the professor and college student.

As one interested in the publication, I wish to make a few remarks about what I think is missing in the paper. Book reviews, and recommendations of books to be read would be an attractive column. I also recommend to the Editors that two columns be given to the exposition of the principles of Anarchism and Syndicalism. I would also suggest that you compare the present stand of the Anarchist-syndicalist movement with that of the Labor Unions in this country.

The labor movement here is looking for salvation from the economic system of today, now on the verge of a breakdown. The answer that a Labor Party will solve the present problems is simply a lot of humbug.

Yours for the cause,

N. Y., Dec. 10 Samuel Rothman

* * *

Editor of "Freedom"
219 Second Avenue
New York City
Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of the first number of "Freedom," which I read with interest, and for which I thank you.

I am not an anarchist, as you know, and I do not think that your paper will set the world afire or will make the slightest ripple in the frozen apathy of the working class, yet I wish to read the paper as an expression of a certain definite intellectual group with a definite, even if untenable, philosophy.

I enjoyed reading the whole number, but particularly so Mr. Bell's letter to Charles Erskine Scott Wood. What he says about the noble Russian experiment is absolutely true.

I enclose a check for $2.00 for one year's subscription, and trust that you will live long enough to celebrate the 30th anniversary of Freedom, as I have just celebrated the 30th anniversary of the *Critic and Guide.*

Very truly yours,

N. Y., Dec. 9 Dr. Wm. J. Robinson

[Dr. Robinson is an old friend who has done valiant service in the liberation of the human mind. He was a pioneer in the movement for Birth Control long before Margaret Sanger was heard of. In his magazine, *The Critic and Guide,* as well as in other publications and in other ways he has for more than thirty years helped to spread light in dark places and in this very important respect he is with us. As long as he continues his work it is not important whether he thinks our ideas are tenable or not. We wish him many happy returns on the 30th anniversary of *The Critic and Guide* and hope that he and the magazine will continue to be with us for a long, long time.]

* * *

Editor, "Freedom":
Dear Sir:

Please send me four copies of January 1st issue.

If you are for the abolition of "Capitalism," I cannot be with you. You yourselves are capitalists, because you employ others to do the work with your equipment. A ditch digger who has two spades and employs a tramp to use one on his job is a capitalist in his degree, just the same as the man who owns a steam shovel. My opinion is that reformers are generally afraid to say "monopoly." That is too simple and practical, to abolish Monopoly, and they take refuge in an abstraction which they are unable to define, called "Capitalism."

Yours cordially,

N. Y., Dec. 21 Bolton Hall

P.S. Myself, I am such a simpleton that I want to take first what belongs to me because I created it; that is, to take what the land would rent for instead of taxes.

If that does not do enough, I will do other things.
B. H.

[Mr. Hall and the writer have known each other for many years which would indicate that they respect each other. All the same I think Mr. Hall is a charming and cultured gentleman and much better than his philosophy.] H. K.

* * *

We have received information from Chicago that some of the comrades like "Freedom" but think it much too mild. Far be it from us to want to surpress or modify any indignation against the present system but we have been hearing violent phrases for so long they seem rather trite to us, besides, they never made any revolution that we have heard of. If events do not make a revolution, then it just doesn't happen. As we see things, the present system is breaking down and unless civilization is to perish some form of cooperative life will have to take its place. Our job is to make men want a free society and to inspire them to work for one so when the breakdown does come at last, a few persons will know what they want and take steps to get it. Let us leave the hot air to the communists and so some constructive work.

HAIL FREIE ARBEITER STIMME!

"FREIE ARBEITER STIMME" oldest Jewish Anarist weekly in the world has entered, with its current issue, the 34th year of uninterrupted life and activity. A splendid record of devotion and perseverance on the part of our Jewish Anarchists. FREEDOM heartily felicitates the older sister-publication and wishes the F.A.S. many more years of courageous work in the Anarchist cause.

The Theatre

By M. Jagendorf

"If you have tears prepare to shed them"

Thus spake the great poet, and I must echo him, for I have discovered that we, the greatest people in the world, we of "God's own country," as any native of any state will tell you, possess one single imperfection. We who have the finest bathrooms and the most perfect vacuum cleaners; we who have the most perfect prohibition laws and the most beautiful women; we lack only one quality to make us paragons.

Rome, at the height of her glory, lacked simplicity. So do we, at the moment when we are greater and better than any other people on earth, lack simplicity. Particularly simplicity in pleasures. Rome needed the sight of good, gentle saints torn violently to bits by underfed animals and overfed gladiators for her daily amusement; and we too demand violent (I almost said vile) action in our plays. Unless such fare is provided the theatre-going mob turns thumbs down. When anything so simple and delightful as the Teatro dei Piccoli (now playing at the Lyric Theatre) comes along someone must say, as one of the critics did, "It does not offer enough variety for an evening." When Lucrece is produced, perhaps the most beautiful production in years of a very beautiful poem, it is labelled as meagre fare, thin and slow, carried along only by a great actress.

The Italian "Teatro dei Piccoli," the most famous of all European puppet organizations, is as much a joy for grown-ups as it is for children. It offers the most whole-hearted laughter that has appeared in New York for years. That is its crime. It does not come up to the stale bed-room humor of the musical reviews; there are no stars come from Hollywood, or going there. Its only recommendation is that it will keep you in constant and happy laughter. It is only unbelievably skillful and gloriously fantastic. You will only sit with open-mouthed delight watching marvelous acrobatic skill, perfect dancing, a side-splitting Spanish bull-fight, the most wonderful, almost humanly educated, donkey, and a piano act almost uncanny in its perfect coordination and ability to suggest the human frailities of a real pianist. Of course I must admit that these qualities do not come up to our ideal of perfect business, inviolable efficiency and Roxy-movie perfection. So mad mobs rush to "Roxy's" doors to see 20,000 yards of fabric with 5,000 fittings, 200 spotlights, 250 policemen to handle traffic, to hear 56 compositions, while the happiest and most perfect entertainment of puppets has only a few admirers.

Poetry! Bunk!

American males are the most chivalrous in the world. Don't we American men spend 85% of all our money with and for women! Even in the theatre we are gentlemen first. Ah! How different from the Frenchmen and the Germans! So the critics sit tight, and polite gentlemen in evening clothes come to see Katherine Cornell in *Lucrece.* What a death it would have had if Miss Cornell and Blanche Yurka were not in it. Robert Edmund Jones, the greatest scenic designer in America, who did the settings, and Robert Lorraine—these being only men, cannot even be considered.

The story, familiar through Shakespeare's poem, deals with the rape of Lucrece by the beastly Tarquin, her public confession, and her suicide. Out of this simple theme the play is formed. Therein lies its crime. Too damned simple. No complicated counterplots, no side love stories, no Italian bootleggers or Jewish or Irish gangsters. Nor any wisecracks. Just simple, beautiful poetry, enough to give pure delight, with now and then a thought to consider. But we have solved all the problems of the world, and poetry and thought are the bunk. After a day's hard work a guy's got to be amused. A good musical comedy, that's the idea.

Mr. Jones has created the most perfectly artistic stage set of his career. Eight columns, an eighteenth-century bed, some curtains. There is rare art that delights both eye and mind. Only a great artist could have done that. Miss Cornell's acting is living poetry, as is Blanche Yurka's, as is that of all the cast. The spinning scene of the five women is poetic pantomime.

That is only art. A lot of junk. A couple of good dancing numbers, some high kickers, a good song. That's the food for the mass of American T.B.M.'s. A fine, beautifully staged poem like *Lucrece,* perfectly acted, is considered at all only out of respect to its leading actress.

Book Reviews

Soviet Russia As I Saw It," by Dr. Wm. J. Robinson. The Critic and Guide Co., 319 West 48th Street, New York, N. Y. $2.00.

"He who is afraid of making enemies should not venture to tell the truth." Dr. Robinson keeps to his own proverb in his book "Soviet Russia as I Saw It," which is written simply and directly. He does not mince words nor use elaborate phrases, and his book—as well as Panait Stratti's "Le Russie Denude"—come to reaffirm more and more that Russia is ruled by social fascists disguised as bolshevists; that the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing but a tyrannical bureaucracy directed by politicians and fanatics, no matter how sincere they may be. Their sadistic attitude, tactics and the ruthlessness with which they treat their opponents puts them in a class with Mussolini, the Kaiser, and the tsars. In fact the chiefs of the bureaucratic party are today the bosses and tsars of Russia. And woe to those who dare to oppose their regime. With their plan of industrialization the masters of Russia are become obsessed with machinery and in their dull madness the machine has become their supreme god.

Dr. Robinson asked a socialist revolutionist, whose name he cannot disclose, what he thought about the G. P. U. and the answer was, "well, our present government is a combination of the Oprishchina and the Spanish inquisition, with the only difference in its favor that instead of subjecting its victims to prolonged physical tortures, it dispatches them quickly into eternity; or where the offense is a minor one or not proven, it sends them to northern Siberia or to some other lonely prison to die of slow starvation."

Dr. Robinson brings a terrible indictment against the Russian government for not allowing people to leave the country, and for paying no attention to old people. They solve the old age problem quite simply. "Let the old die"! One cannot leave Russia easily. A foreign passport costs $103 for each person—and where would one couple find $206 for passports alone, when they have no money to buy even a little additional food?

And so people risk death, in order to escape from the country through devious ways. Human life is cheap in Russia. To many, better death than life so oppressed, starved, crushed. Sherwood Eddy related to Dr. Robinson that out of 149 men who tried to pass the Manchurian frontier, 130 were shot, or captured to be brought back and shot. Out of the 19 who escaped 4 were wounded. This story was corroborated by one of the men who had tried, failed and was wounded.

Dr. Robinson writes of the good, such as it is, as well as the bad and weighs them both. It is up to the reader to judge. To her non-political prisoners Russia is the most lenient and merciful, while to her political suspects she is ruthless and merciless. Dr. Robinson was not allowed to visit any of the political prisoners.

Regarding the reduction of illiteracy, so much spoken about, he writes, "I accept it *cum grano salis* and not only with a grain of salt, but with a whole pailful," and gives his reasons why.

The suppression of the freedom of the press is immeasurably more stringent than it is even in the most reactionary countries, such as Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and incalculably more vicious than it was under the tsars. One can read only whatever periodical or book the government wants one to read. And what poor stuff the reading matter is! To the bolshevists freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly are nothing but decaying, burgeois-liberal traditions. They have destroyed all fetishes, all gods, but they are replacing them with bolshevist dogmatic doctrines and their new god, Lenin. Of the censorship Dr. Robinson writes, "You cannot read about the brutal tactics which were adopted to force the peasants into collectivization, the shooting which followed their refusal, the misery heaped upon the so-called Kulaks, describe the horrors undergone by numerous political exiles and prisoners, attempt to question the correctness of the entire regime, try to express a doubt as to the ultimate workability of the Communist structure, try to criticize Stalin or the members of the Politbureau, in short, attempt fundamental criticism which is permitted in every democratic country; attempt it and you will find yourself in a dungeon in the clutches of the G. P. U. from which you may never escape to see the light of day again."

Yet of the personality of the Russian he writes they are notable for their kindness, altruism and comradeship.

The individual is of no account in Russia. He is considered a worm with no right to complain. The State is everything, and as such dictates and crushes everything in its path.

The greatest tragedy in Russia is the slow starvation of its people; and the complete lack of sanitation. The greater part of the population is undernourished. Millions suffer from malnutrition. The food is so poor that dogs here would disdain to touch it. There is dread misery in Russia and a deep undercurrent of sullen discontent. Bad as conditions are in the city, they are worse in the villages. The peasants are dying of hunger, and many actually eat the seeds intended for sowing to prolong life a little while longer.

Yet of the entire regime; of its accomplishments, its crimes and stupidities as well as its stability, Dr. Robinson writes briefly and well. But to see the things as he saw them, one must read the book. He is not an Anarchist and does not see it from an Anarchist angle. He merely tells the truth as he sees it and today that is most necessary.

LOUIS RAYMOND

INTERESTING "MOVIES" IN
FREE WORKERS CENTER

Saturday, January 14, the films made at the last Freie Arbeiter Stimme Bazaar will be shown at the Free Workers Center, 219 Second Avenue, N. Y. Dozens of amusing scenes and many "stars." Also a fine musical program. Admission twenty-five cents.

All proceeds for the F. A. S.

REVOLUTIONARY SPAIN

By M. OLAY

Some day in the near future I hope that Spain will be to Anarchism what Russia is today to Bolshevism, namely the land in which it is being practiced. And I say this because Spain is unique in that its workers and the people at large, including all the extreme left political parties with the exception of the socialists and their cousins the communists, look to Anarchism for the solution of the social and economic problems confronting them. In no other country in the world have the teachings of Anarchism, both pure and modified, gone so deep into the fabric of the social and political life as they have in Spain.

In order to give you a clearer vision of the present Spain and its possibilities for tomorrow I think it will be well to acquaint you somewhat with the Spanish people of yesterday and to give you some of their contemporary history since I feel that you will hear more of that turbulent nation in the near future than you have heard heretofore.

Spain is a country of about twenty-four millions, of which some 40% are illiterate, although many new schools have been opened since the establishment of the Republic. (Let this be said to the credit of the Republicans.) The Spanish people are practically one race except for the Catalonians and Biscayans. These groups are to a certain degree more attached to traditions, some of them, that is, and keep alive the spirit of independence, they would like to be separated entirely or almost so from the rest of Spain so they might conduct their political, social and religious life in the manner they saw fit and according to their traditions. However, these racial elements constitute no serious problem when viewed in the light of national unity. The other races have in the course of time been so mixed and intermixed that they no longer constitute a separate element, and no cry of independence or separation has been heard from them. We may say, then, that to all practical purposes Spain is a racial unit.

Spain is predominantly an agricultural country. There are about 6½ agricultural workers to about 4½ industrial workers. However, there are listed as workers such professionals as lawyers, doctors, etc., who it is calculated come to about a million. We may say for illustrative purposes that Spain is industrially about half-way between pre-war Russia and present-day Italy.

Spain is traditionally the land of Anarchism. From the very inception of the First International, Spain was one of the most fertile grounds for the ideas of that famous organization, and Bakunin found his best friends and cooperators among the Spaniards. The First International had tremendous power in Spain, its numerical strength being figured as high as fifty thousand members, which is a very high figure when we consider that Spain at that time had no more than fifteen million population and hardly any industry. In Jerez de la Frontera, in Andalusia, the members of the First International even attempted a social revolution, and eight of their leaders were hanged in the public square. That heroic gesture of the Spanish internationalists was called the Black Hand Conspiracy by the government and the press.

Anarchism in Spain has passed through many phases, as is usually the case with advanced movements and philosophies. It had the period of propaganda by deed (terrorism) when its message was mostly sentimental; it had the intellectual period; and it is now going through what I would call the period of rational organization, the final period, I hope, before the advent of the social revolution.

The Spanish labor forces have been divided into two principal sections—the conservative socialists on the one side and the anarchists and syndicalists on the other. This division was more pronounced and clear-cut before the Russian Revolution, when many from the ranks of the left socialists, some syndicalists and even some anarchists formed the Communist Party.

We have in Spain today three groups contending for the hegemony over the working people, namely socialists, communists, and anarchists or anarcho-syndicalists. The relative numerical strength of the various factions will enlighten you as to the real situation in this country. The socialists claim to have 100,000 members. Besides, they control the labor union called, *Union General de Trabajadores*, which has about 500,000 members and from which are drawn most of the members of the Socialist Party. The official Communist Party (the Stalin faction) claims to have 10,000 members. Then come the Anarcho-syndicalists with their *Confederation General del Trabajo* (National Confederation of Labor) with a membership of over a million. We may say, then, that there are in Spain nearly a million and a half workers organized into bona-fide labor unions, of whom nearly three-quarters are affiliated with the anarcho-syndicalists. Most of the communists belong either to the anarcho-syndicalist unions or to their own, for they have split from the C.N.T. in some places, such as in the port of Seville and in the mines of Asturias, and have formed their own union. In Asturias they captured the miners' unions of the anarcho-syndicalists, and now there are three unions:—socialist, anarcho-syndicalist and communist.

Now that you have an idea of the numerical strength of the Spanish labor and revolutionary forces let us see what each faction wants. The socialists, with 110 assemblymen in the Constituent Assembly, composed of about 430 members, want "good" laws for the protection of labor. In other words, they are and act very much like their social-democratic brothers all over the world. Since they have been in the government they have been acting very much like the McDonalds, Scheidemanns, Noskes, etc. What do the communists want? They want to do the same thing their brothers have done in Russia, namely, overthrow the Republic and establish the so-called Dictatorship of the Proletariat. And what do the anarchists and syndicalists or anarcho-syndicalists want? This is what I shall try to explain, since it is not generally known in this country.

As you know, in every party or sect, in the propogation of every idea there are three main tendencies which manifest themselves in various forms. They are the right, the center and the left. This is true of the socialists, the communists, the anarchists, the I.W.W. and ordinary labor organizations or political parties. There are over a million men and women in the anarcho-syndicalist unions. Naturally the majority of these workers are not anarchists or syndicalists, nor do they belong to any given party or social school. The majority are people more or less like the members of all other big labor unions —that is, a passive mass who follow the leaders and are in the union through convenience, coercion, or simply to protect themselves against the abuses of the masters. This is especially true of unions controlling the jobs, as in Catalonia. Let me illustrate. If the building trades of Barcelona have, let us say, 10,000 members it does not follow that those ten thousand are anarchists or syndicalists. In all probability the majority are just ordinary workers, but this majority never counts, in Barcelona or anywhere else for that matter. They are the mass who raise their hands to vote yes or no according to the views of the leaders, whether such leaders be socialists, anarchists or communists, and who usually stay home in case of serious trouble. After that portion of passive men comes another large element, sympathizers, some class-conscious, who will fight for their rights and take an interest in the march of the organization. This element will follow a movement for the emancipation of their class, although they may not start it. This, I dare say, is the most numerous active element among all advanced organized revolutionary parties or groups. And this element, in the case of the Anarcho-syndicalist C.N.T., is anarchistic although not anarchist. And in the third group I will put the really active, class-conscious, intelligent members who know what they want and are willing to sacrifice themselves for their ideals—the element that goes to jail and leads the people, the sympathizers and the colorless to victory or defeat. This really class-conscious element is never very numerous, but it is very active, tireless, and therefore it exerts considerable influence among the masses and accomplishes great things considering its relatively small number.

How many out of the large membership of the C.N.T. are really class-conscious? This, of course, nobody can tell with accuracy, but if I say a third, I will be giving a high figure. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that there are about 300,000 class-conscious revolutionary workers in Spain, not sympathizers but really class-conscious workers who know what they want and are willing to fight for it. This number must be divided again into the conservatives and radicals, or as we say here, rights and lefts. On the side of the rights we have the "serious" element with leaders such as Pestaffa, Peiro, Clara, and others, who on August of last year, on the occasion of the General Strike in Catalonia, when the so-called hotheads or lefts wanted enthusiasm of the workers with a manifesto—now to start a social-revolution, threw cold water on the famous and historical—saying that the people were not prepared for social revolution, that a revolution at that time, even if triumphant, would inevitably end in dictatorship. On the other hand we have the *left* element—the irresponsible element as they are called by the "serious" conservatives—the anarchists who think more of revolution and education than hours and conditions for union members, who are more optimistic of results, who would make the revolution right now and who affirm that the people are prepared, that the time is ripe and who are willing to start the fight at the first opportunity.

The now famous manifesto of the right wing of the anarcho-syndicalists was the cause of a serious split that for a time threatened the growth of and development of the C.N.T. The thirty men who signed the manifesto in question were recognized leaders of the C.N.T. However, it is evident from the outcome that the left elements, especially those of the Anarchist Federation, are very strong in the National Confederation of Labor, for the staff of the anarcho-syndicalist daily paper, *Solidaridad Obrera*, then in the hands of the rights, was immediately replaced with left Anarchists.

I have a copy of the famous—infamous, according to the lefts—Manifesto and I have translated its salient paragraphs, which I shall quote so that you may know the arguments of the rights in defense of their opposition to a revolution last August. In justice to them, who have been attacked from every side, and are even called traitors, and who with a few exceptions have been driven out of their official positions in the C.N.T., you should be acquainted with their side.

Here are some excerpts from the historic document:

"Some say that revolution has always been made by audacious minorities who have impelled the people to go against the constituted authorities, and

that it is sufficient that those audacious minorities want it, that in situations such as the present one the destruction of the established regime and the defensive forces supporting it will be an accomplished fact."

"That those minorities, provided with aggressive elements, will one fine day, by surprise, face the army and provoke a clash which may lead to the revolution."

"Rudimentary preparation, a few elements of assault to begin with, they say, are sufficient. They depend for the triumph of the revolution on the courage of a few individuals and the problematic intervention of the multitudes which will follow them when they are on the street."

"It is not necessary to foresee anything, nor to count on anything—only to get out to the street and fight and beat the State."

"To think that the State has formidable elements of defense, that it is hard to destroy so long as its source of power, its moral dominion over the people, its economy, its justice, its moral and economic credit are not broken by scandals and stupidity, by the immorality and incapacity of its leaders and by the weakening of its institutions; to think that unless this takes place it will be possible to destroy the State, is to waste time, to forget history and even to know human psychology. This is forgotten. It is being forgotten now—even the very revolutionary moral is being forgotten."

"Everything is left to chance; everything is expected from the unforseen; we believe in the miracles of Saint Revolution as though the revolution were a panacea and not a painful and cruel fact which man must forge with the suffering of his body and the pain of his mind."

Then it goes on to say that this way of regarding the revolution is the demagogic way, the way which the old political parties have followed, but that this is not and should not be the way of the anarchists. They say also that an uprising at this time would inevitably end in defeat and Republican Fascism, that the preparation should not be only that of fighting elements, but that it should also, and even more be of the moral element, the element which is today strongest, most destructive and the hardest to overcome. They argue further that a revolution now, even if successful, without the moral development of the masses, will inevitably make dictators of their leaders whether such leaders be anarchists or anything else.

Here is a quotation which will give you a rather clear idea of their purposes and objectives. It reads: "We are revolutionaries, yes, but not cultivators of the revolutionary myth. We want capitalism and the State, be it red or white, to disappear, not to be replaced by another, but in a manner so that when the economic revolution is made by the organized working class, this same working class will be able to prevent the establishment of any other state power no matter of what color."

"We want a revolution born out of a deep desire in the people, like the one which is now being prepared, and not a revolution made to order, which is offered to us; a revolution which a few individuals are trying to force upon us; for if such a revolution came these same individuals, no matter what they may call themselves, would inevitably become dictators the day after the triumph."

Now you are familiar with the arguments of the right wing of the Spanish anarchists or anarcho-syndicalists against a social revolution at this time. They feel that the people at large are not prepared for so fundamental a change as living without government.

They believe, first, that to have a revolution now, in view of the strong position of the State and the faith of the people in general in the present capitalist institutions, would be suicidal, inevitably ending in defeat and in the establishment of a Republican dictatorship. That even were the revolution successful, the result would be another dictatorship by some other faction, which faction, according to them, might be the anarchists. They say that possibly under the circumstances it is better to wait and in the meantime carry on a strong educational anarchist propaganda to prepare the people.

Evidently this view of the right wing of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalists does not find much echo among the anarchist majority, for practically all the Spanish anarchist papers, and there are quite a number, have since been attacking those thirty leaders.

Living in America, out of contact with the Spanish people and the rank and file of the Spanish anarchists, it is hard for me to tell which side is right. When I read the manifesto of the "rights" and nothing else I believe the rights are right, but when I read the literature of the lefts, I am no longer sure.

As I read further the "left" literature and periodicals I gradually change my mind and become (almost) a "left." Naturally, the best way to judge anything is to hear both sides. It would seem, however, that the rights do not have many friends or publications, for I know of only one paper in their favor, whereas all the others are in favor of the lefts.

One can not take partisan statements at their face value. If the Spanish government issues a statement to the effect that the Spanish people is solidly behind the Republic, or a similar statement comes from Mussolini with regard to Italy, or Stalin with regard to Russia, we may safely conclude that they are at least a little over-optimistic. We can not very well judge the degree of satisfaction in which the people of Russia and Italy live today, because the dissatisfied people in those countries have no way of making their feelings known. However, we do have a way of finding out in Spain, where there is a remarkable degree of freedom of expression. And from the expressions of the masses in their press and in their meetings and in their general talk, we can see that they are dissatisfied and that we may reasonably expect an even chance of success, although I don't think the chances are as favorable as some of the lefts seem to believe. That there is dissatisfaction is shown by the fact that in the one and a half years of the Republican regime more than 150 men and women have been killed in clashes with soldiers, police and civil guards, and that at present there are several thousand men in prison.

Everybody knows that it is relatively easy to overthrow a political or even a social system, but that it is not so easy to maintain the triumph. Let us suppose that the Spanish anarcho-syndicalists, through a combination of circumstances, succeeded in overthrowing the Republic. What would happen? How would they manage things? What kind of "government" would they establish? Would they grant freedom to everybody and would people live in anarchism, practicing the motto, "To each according to his needs and from each according to his ability?" Would there be absolute freedom? What would be done with those who refused to work or to cooperate? What would be done in this case or that? Could they carry on without a strong centralized government? etc., etc.

These are the usual questions that anarchists are asked to answer in discussion. Some of them are pertinent and deserve consideration. We are so used to having everything handed to us, we are so lazy in mind, that we don't seem to be able to conceive of anything which does not follow old patterns. When the economic and social systems in Russia were overthrown, the capitalist world cried that the new system would not last, that it *could* not last, because it was against human nature, against the designs of God, against everything in heaven and on earth. In short, they claimed that it would not and could not last because it was an experiment. They argued that if the profit incentive were taken from the people nobody would want to work, nobody would want to excel, and so forth. Yet, this happened over fifteen years ago and the new system is still in existence. I shall not say here whether that system is good or bad, that is not the point. What I want to point out is that it was a new system never tried before, and it worked, or at least it has worked as well as capitalism, certainly not worse.

Now the Spanish Anarchists have another system in view. Something still newer than the system established by the Bolsheviki in 1917. The Spanish anarchists mean to overthrow the capitalist system, and the State, and to replace them with another social and economic system in which the State will not exist. How? Let me remark before proceeding that anarchists realize that it is not possible to change from capitalist exploitation to anarchism with all its accompanying blessings—full individual freedom, economic independence, and so forth, at one jump. They are not such visionaries. They realize that anarchism will come by gradual states, but they also realize and feel, (remember this) that in order to start something, in order to accomplish some aim, it is necessary to start somewhere and that the best way to attain liberty is to start practicing it. The anarchists realize that liberty is not won through dictatorship, that the disappearance of the state will not come by propping it up and by extending its field of action. They know that anarchism will not come by the state reinforced and making it the arbiter of everything material and spiritual.

(*To be continued*)

FREE SOCIETY FORUM
1241 N. California Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

AT 8:00 P.M.

Sunday, January 15
SOPHIE FAGIN
Parents and Children

Sunday, January 22
JOSEPH COHEN
Rational Education at Home and in the School

Sunday, January 29
DR. G. HEINER
Art and Radicalism

Admission Free *Questions and Discussions*

DETROIT
EDUCATIONAL FORUM
Deliberative Non-Partisan
at the
Libertarian Center
2105 Third Street Cor. Elizabeth St.
A place to exchange thoughts intelligently

Sunday, Jan. 15, 1933 7:30 P.M.
HYMAN MELLON
Causes of Crime and Treatment of Criminals

Sunday, Jan. 22, 1933 7:30 P.M.
JOE RADDING
The Coming Economic Policy in America

Sunday, Jan. 29, 1933 7:30 P.M.
JOSEPH COHEN
The Possibilities of Anarchism in the Near Future

Lectures Every Sunday at 7:30 P.M.
Questions and Discussion

Admission Free Public Invited

CAN THESE THINGS BE?

"Jobless in state placed at 1,750,000. Relief survey shows total is increasing, with crisis due in next four months. 410,000 families helped. $62,000,000 spent in the year ended November 1, from public funds to ease want." [This represents about one person out of every three engaged in gainful occupation in the State.] *N. Y. Times,* Jan. 2, 1933.

* * *

"Connecticut finds 2 cents a day wage. Department of Labor investigators report actual wages payments of 2 cents for a day's work, 40 cents for 120 hours, 65 cents for fifty-eight hours, $1.08 for eighty hours. Most of the charges on which operators of establishments paying such meager wages have been brought into court carry a maximum penalty of $20 fine, so that even conviction, under the present statutes, is a comparatively harmless affair." *N. Y. Times,* Dec. 16, 1932.

* * *

"A final lump sum war debt settlement by means of a long-term loan was advocated by Sir Arthur Balfour, leader of the British steel industry, in the Observer today.

"My own view," he says, "is that we shall finally have to offer America to float a loan for $1,000,000,000 in the States at say 3½ per cent with the right to pay it off within the next sixty years at our option, and that is the maximum we will ever be able to pay." *N. Y. Times,* Jan. 2, 1933.

[The war debts due from the Allies are estimated at $11,000,000,000, so $1,000,000,000 means about 9%. The people of the United States are asked to take from their sugar bowls and stockings one billion dollars and lend it to the Allies with which they strike a bargain for cash with the government of the people of the United States and then pay the people 3½ per cent for waiting for their money. If any of our readers fail to understand this just call it High Finance and let it go at that.]

* * *

"Says twenty horses cost tax payers $876,470 a year. The budget calls for $821,220 for the salaries of stable keepers, hostlers and others for the care of horses. The total number of men being 413, declared Mr. Boland. (Frank A. K. Boland, representing the Hotel Men's Association and the Citizens' Budget Commission in a statement before the Board of Estimate of New York City.) Codes 2336K and 2336N provided for twenty-five more men in the capacities of wheelwrights, carriage upholsterers and harness makers at a total salary of $55,250."

"There are 293 horses, of which twenty are reported by the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as capable of a full day's work. The labor charge is therefore at the rate of $43,873 per horse per year." *World-Telegram,* N. Y. Nov. 22, 1932.

[A few days after this item appeared 175 of the horses were sold for $2,000.]

* * *

"Frank W. Cunningham, who gets $7,500 a year, is provided with a private secretary and until recently a limousine and chauffeur as chairman of the Aldermanic Finance Committee, assists his fellow committee members in the annual heckling of private citizens who come asking for a reduction in the city budget.

Samuel Seabury had Mr. Cunningham on the witness stand recently and asked him, 'Do you do anything except attend meetings and vote?'

'That is all.'

'What do you do?'

'I just attend meetings and vote. I have no other facilities. It is all done by the Comptroller.' . . .

The *World-Telegram* has long advocated the abolition of the sixty-five Aldermen as a chorus of yes-men for Boss Curry, meeting an hour a week, getting $5,000 each—except the few who get $7,000—and being served by eleven sergeants-at-arms at $1,500 each and a greater number of clerical helpers." *World-Telegram,* N. Y. Recent date.

[Who said times were hard? $100 an hour is not bad.]

* * *

"Hague outlines united fight on labor rackets. Offers to lead crusade if all employers will resist gangster tactics. Assails gas pipe reign. Finds terrorism driving business from Jersey City." *N. Y. Times,* recent date.

[Hague, Mayor of Jersey City and political boss there, has his own racket and objects to others muscling in.]

"$60,000,000 tied up in Kentucky whiskey, State speculates rather pathetically on the good it could do with the money. Pins hopes on Congress. If it could sell 5,000,000 gallons, mostly pre-war bourbon, it could balance its budget." *N. Y. Times,* Dec. 1, 1932.

[In the face of such a tragedy words fail us.]

* * *

"A second suit against former Mayor James J. Walker and his wife, Janet Allen Walker, was filed in the Supreme Court yesterday, when Sommers, Inc., of 2 West Fifty-seventh Street, asked judgment against both for $2,141 as a balance due on purchases of foot wear and hand bags between November 10, 1930 and March 2, 1932, aggregating $2,742. The previous suit was brought by Hattie Carnegie, modiste, for a balance of $12,059 for gowns and other apparel purchased by Mrs. Walker in excess of $20,000 in less than two years. . . . On August 21, 1931, Mrs. Walker bought eighteen pairs of shoes and two pairs of mules at a total cost of $790, an average of $39.50 a pair." *World Telegram.*

[To the girl who has been raised to believe that honesty is the best policy it must surely be a comfort to know that God in his infinite wisdom has been so good to the little fat lady who makes frequent trips to Europe and Florida where she has her pictures taken to provide amusement and encouragement for working girls who think life has given them a bad break. Perhaps Mrs. Walker is trying to reduce the surplus of shoes and mules and put shoemakers back to work? Whatever the reason this lawsuit helps us understand why Master Block, 10-year-old-son of the millionaire publisher of Brooklyn, asked his father if Mr. Walker could live on a salary of $25,000 a year.]

* * *

" 'Technocracy'—is it a new mouth wash, a corn plaster or has some scientists just hired a press agent? It says you only work four hours a day, and there will be no politicians. That last is the best selling clause it has. There is not a man in this country that can't make a living for himself and his family. But, he can't make a living for them and his government, too, the way his government is living. What the government has got to do is live as cheap as the people. Then you don't need 'technocracy!' Yours, Will Rogers, *N. Y. Times,* Dec. 21, 1932."

[Believe it or not, Will Rogers gets paid for stuff like that.]

TO OUR READERS

THIS is the second issue of FREEDOM. *The Editors hope that as each succeeding issue makes its appearance the aim and objectives of this periodical will become more and more crystallized and apparent.*

At present the paramount and most urgent need is our wherewithal—funds and more funds—to assure the stability and security of FREEDOM.

The foremost source of income must be a constantly growing list of readers and increasing patronage, a substantial number of paid subscribers must be the financial backbone of FREEDOM.

Have you already paid your $2.00 for a year's subscription, or are you as yet a casual reader? Don't wait for letters or reminders; we cannot afford the expensive luxury of such correspatronage; a substantial number of paid subscrt distribution of this periodical with a minimum of expenditures.

If you are not merely a reader, but also a friend of FREEDOM *and what it stands for, you can do much to help us in our difficult undertaking in more ways than one:*

1. *send in at once $2.00 for a year's subscription if you have as yet not done so.*
2. *Make an effort to procure subscriptions for* FREEDOM *among your friends, acquaintances, etc.*
3. *Order a number of copies and try to circulate them weekly among your fellow-workers, at meetings, gatherings, etc.*
4. *Arrange or help to arrange meetings and entertainments for the benefit of* FREEDOM.
5. *Send us the names of possible prospects as readers of* FREEDOM.

ROAD TO FREEDOM PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
219 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Enclosed please find $.....

for.....year's subscription of FREEDOM.

Name .....

Address .....

Help in every way. Do it at once. Let us with united effort make FREEDOM *a widely circulated periodical.*

EDITORS AND ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Kindly fill out and mail at your earliest convenience. FREEDOM *depends on subscribers and readers.*

Lectures Under the Auspices of
THE LIBERTARIAN GROUP
OF NEW YORK
(Anarchist)

Meets at
INTERNATIONAL CENTER
227 East 12th Street
Near Second Avenue
EVERY WEDNESDAY AT 8:30 P.M.

January 11th
ROGER N. BALDWIN
Director—American Civil Liberties Union
The Philosophy of Liberty in a World of Violence

January 18th
EX BROTHER LUCIAN
F. S. C.
The Rackets of the Roman Catholic Church

January 25th
HARRY KELLY
Co-editor of "Freedom"
News From Nowhere

OPEN FORUM — QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS
Invite Your Friends *Admission Free*
DANCE — January 21st — ADMISSION 25¢